

Determination of NEPA Adequacy (DNA)
U.S. Department of Interior
Bureau of Land Management

OFFICE: Phoenix District Office (PDO)

NEPA/TRACKING NUMBER: DOI-BLM-AZ-P0000-2012-004-DNA

CASEFILE/PROJECT NUMBER: AZA – 32639-02

PROPOSED ACTION TITLE/TYPE: Palo Verde Hub to Sun Valley Substation 500 kV Transmission Line – Temporary Use Permit - DNA

LOCATION/LEGAL DESCRIPTION: This project is for 7 temporary work areas and temporary roads for an approximately 43-mile long, 500 kV transmission lines from the Palo Verde Hub Substation through the Delaney Switchyard to the Sun Valley Substation – T. 2 N., R. 8 W., Sec. 2 (1.93 acres); T. 3 N., R. 6 W., Sec. 15 (0.16 acres); T. 3 N., R. 6 W., Sec. 14 (0.21 acres); T. 3 N., R. 6 W., Sec 13 (1.34 acres); T. 3 N., R. 6 W., Sec. 24 (1.28 acres); T. 3 N., R. 5 W., Sec. 2 (0.95 acres); and T. 4 N., R. 4 W., Sec. 29 (2.79 acres) Total of 8.66 acres.

APPLICANT (if any): Arizona Public Service

A. Description of the Proposed Action and any applicable mitigation measures

The proposed action is to provide temporary access (roads and/or pull areas) for construction based on final engineering drawings which refines the actual transmission line alignment. Following the issuance of the 1/21/2006 ROW Grant, this 500 kV transmission line was not built because of a change in APS priorities and lack of final engineering. APS priorities have again changed and this line is scheduled for construction initiation in the fall of 2012 with completion and an in-service date by 2014. This project provides the temporary access that will be needed during the construction phase of building this 42-44 mile long 200' wide ROW. The all temporary pull/work areas and temporary access roads are within the EA study area. The same mitigation measures as outlined in the 2006 ROW grant will be applied to this temporary construction grant. See attached Exhibit A for a map.

B. Land Use Plan Conformance

Land Use Plan (LUP) Name: Bradshaw-Harquahala Record of Decision and Approved Resource Management Plan, April 2010; LR-2-Utility corridors are designated to meet future expected demands for energy and water transmission facilities...Facilities significant enough to be basis for corridor designation are the following:...electric transmission facilities accommodating 115 kV lines or greater voltage..." This project is within the CAP and Palo Verde-Devers ROWs and established utility corridors; page 30. Lower Gila South Resource Management Plan (BLM, 1988) which defines land uses

along the Palo Verde to Devers Utility Corridor.

Date Approved/Amended: **4/1/2010**

☒ The proposed action is in conformance with the applicable LUP because it is specifically provided for in the following LUP decision(s):

☐ The proposed action is in conformance with the LUP, even though it is not specifically provided for, because it is clearly consistent with the following LUP decision(s) (objectives, terms, and conditions):

C. Identify applicable National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) documents and other related documents that cover the proposed action.

Environmental Assessment Palo Verde Hub to TS-5 Substation 500kV Transmission Project, April 2005, Prepared by EPG.

Finding of No Significant Impact, for EA AZ-020-2004-0056, Signed 10/26/2005 by Terri Raml.

A Cultural Resource Survey for the Proposed Arizona Public Service Palo Verde Hub to TS-5 Transmission Project, Maricopa County, Arizona; EPG Cultural Resource Services Technical Paper Number 2004-1421.

Special Status Species Information for Proposed Palo Verde to TS-5 Transmission Line Project, response letter dated February 26, 2004, Arizona Game and Fish Department.

D. NEPA Adequacy Criteria

- 1. Is the proposed action a feature of, or essentially similar to, an alternative analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)? Is the project within the same analysis area, or if the project location is different, are the geographic and resource conditions sufficiently similar to those analyzed in the exiting NEPA document(s)? If there are differences, can you explain why they are not substantial?**

Yes, the proposed action is within the study area analyzed in the EA.

The final engineering drawings for the temporary work areas (pull areas) and temporary construction/access roads were recently received. All temporary areas are within the areas surveyed for the project and within the analysis area.

- 2. Is the range of alternatives analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s) appropriate with respect to the new proposed action, given current environmental concerns, interests, and resource values?**

Yes, the range of alternatives analyzed in the existing NEPA document is appropriate

with respect to the new proposed action. The proposed action is to grant temporary (3 years) access during construction for the ROW grant AZA-32369 originally granted in January 11, 2006 and amended in May 2012.

- 3. Is the existing analysis valid in light of new information or circumstances (such as, rangeland health standard assessment, recent endangered species listings, and updated lists of BLM-sensitive species)? Can you reasonably conclude that new information and new circumstances would not substantially change the analysis of the new proposed action?**

The existing analysis is valid in light of the engineering drawings and alignment for the temporary access roads and pull/work areas. It can be reasonably concluded that these temporary areas would not substantially change the analysis of the new proposed action. There are no new environmental circumstances since the 2005 EA.

A Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) was signed on 10/26/2005 by Teri Raml. The Decision Record (DR) was also signed on 10/26/2005 and it decided that APS should be granted a 200' wide, approximately 44 miles in length ROW to design, construct, operate, maintain and own a 500 kV electric transmission line. The temporary construction areas are all within the study area of the EA. (Attachment B).

- 4. Are the direct, indirect, and cumulative effects that would result from implementation of the new proposed action similar (both quantitatively and qualitatively) to those analyzed in the existing NEPA document?**

Yes, the direct, indirect, and cumulative effects that would result from construction of the temporary access roads and pull/work areas for this 500 kV transmission line are similar to those analyzed in the existing NEPA document. The area analyzed was substantially larger than the actual area needed to allow for the actual placement of the transmission towers based on topography and actual conditions on the ground and on the temporary access that would be needed for construction.

- 5. Are the public involvement and interagency review associated with existing NEPA documents(s) adequate for the current proposed action?**

Yes, the public involvement and interagency review associated with existing NEPA document is adequate for the current proposed action. The proposed action is within the original NEPA analysis area. For the original project, a jurisdictional meeting was held in mid-March 2004 for potentially impacted agencies; One public open house in Tonopah conducted on March 30, 2004; and informational letter mailed to over 300 individuals in March 2004; a BLM newsletter distributed to approximately 7,600 people (included APS customers and private landowners) in study area. This project is for temporary access and work areas only during construction of the larger project.

E. Persons/Agencies/BLM Staff Consulted

<u>Name</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Resource/Agency Represented</u>
Federal Agencies:		U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service U.S. Bureau of Reclamation U.S. Department of Defense – Luke Air Force Base Western Area Power Administration
Native American Tribes		Ak-Chin Indian Community Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation Fort Mojave Tribe Gila River Indian Community Hopi Tribe Salt-River Pima-Maricopa Community Yavapai-Apache Nation Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe
State Agencies:		Arizona Department of Environmental Quality AZ DOT AGFD AZ State Historic Preservation Office Arizona State Land Dept. AZ State Museum Central AZ Water Conservation District
County and City Governments:		Maricopa County (MC) Association of Governments MC Board of Supervisors (Andrew Kunasek, Max Wilson, & Mary Rose Wilcox) MC DOT MC Flood Control District MC Parks & Recreation Dept. MC Planning Department MC Trails Development Committee Tonopah Community Council Tonopah Valley Association Town of Buckeye

Note: Refer to the EA/EIS for a complete list of the team members participating in the preparation of the original environmental analysis or planning documents

CONCLUSION:

Based on the review documented above, I conclude that this proposal conforms to the applicable land use plan and that the NEPA documentation fully covers the proposed action and constitute BLM's compliance with the requirements of NEPA.

Kathleen Depukat, Project Manager

Leah Baker, P&EC

Angelita S. Bullets, Phoenix District Manager

Date

Note: The signed Conclusion on this Worksheet is part of an interim step in the BLM's internal decision process and does not constitute an appealable decision. However, the lease, permit, or other authorization based on this DNA is subject to protest or appeal under 43 CFR Part 4 and the program-specific regulations.